

UNITARY

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL
SCHOOL LIBRARY
CONTENTS

Editorial Comments	99
Jesus, the Radical.....	100
<i>Horace L. Bachelder</i>	
About This Organization Man.....	105
<i>John A. Crane</i>	
Humanism—The Faith That Will Survive.....	111
<i>Bruce Farnum</i>	
The Church and Human Dignity.....	115
<i>V. Ogden Vogt</i>	
Challenge and Duty.....	119
<i>Leo Hirsch</i>	
Bookman's Notebook	121
Western Unitarian Conference.....	125

Nov.-DEC. 1957

VOL. CXLIII, No. 4

U N I T Y

Established 1878

RANDALL S. HILTON, *Editor*

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

HORACE L. BAGHELDER—"Jesus, the Radical"—is Minister of the Atkinson Memorial Congregational Church, Oregon City, Oregon.

JOHN A. CRANE—"About This Organization Man"—is the Minister of the Park Forest Unitarian Fellowship, Park Forest, Illinois.

BRUCE FARNUM—"Humanism—The Faith That Will Survive"—is a Senior student in the Athol, Massachusetts, High School.

LEO HIRSCH—"Challenge and Duty"—is a free-lance writer and lecturer.

CHARLES W. PHILLIPS—"Bookman's Notebook"—is Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Omaha, Nebraska, and a regular contributor to UNITY.

V. OGDEN VOGT—"The Church and Human Dignity"—is Minister Emeritus of the First Unitarian Society of Chicago; author of *Art and Religion* and *Modern Worship*; at the present time he is serving the Unitarian Fellowship of Palm Beach County, Florida.

Published bimonthly except during July and August
by the


Abraham Lincoln Centre
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago 15, Illinois

Subscription \$2.

Single Copies 50 cents.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

Editorial Comments

E HAVE been reading *The Hidden Persuaders* by Vance Packard. It is intriguing to learn how far the P.R. boys will go to sell their clients' products. It certainly is *public* relations. There is nothing, really nothing, left that is private. Fascinating as it is to see how depth psychology is translated into dynamic selling, it is downright startling to discover what kind of a person you yourself are by the kinds and brands of things you buy.

Sputnik I and Sputnik II have demonstrated either the discovery of a new source of power or vastly increased efficiency in utilizing the known sources. The United States is now embarking on a horrendous effort to "catch up" with and surpass the Russians. Success in this will give us that sense of security which comes from having the ability to annihilate the Russians as fast and effectively as they can liquidate us. Unless some counteracting force or power is discovered or developed, the end can only be the atomization of civilization. No country as yet has been willing to learn to use more efficiently and effectively any of the power resources for

brotherhood. Traditional sources have failed to provide any jet propulsion toward peace. The great need now is for an ICBM, Inter-Continental Brotherhood Mission, which can hit the target of genuine harmonious human relations.

It has been said that it takes a great deal of humanistic grace to withstand Christian insolence. This is particularly true when Christian criticism of Humanism and humanists comes from self-righteousness and complacency based on obfuscation and ignorance. There are legitimate criticisms of Humanism, as there are of Christianity, but they are not found in charges of negative emotional reactions to a frustrated youth. A knowledge of John Dewey, Herbert Mead, Max Otto, Roy Wood Sellars, Julian Huxley, and Bertrand Russell is essential to a free and open intellectual encounter between Christian belief and humanistic faith.

Charles Phillips in the current Bookman's Notebook suggests that the next task for liberals is to translate "theological anthropology or the doctrine of man" into a secular idiom. I would go even further and say that the next

great frontier for liberal religion is to put the important concepts of the major disciplines into the language of the layman. Every specialized profession or discipline develops its own jargon. This becomes a "shorthand" means of communication for the "insiders" but it is often confusing or meaningless to everyone else. Ministers, social workers, economists, or any other group become so used to the language peculiar to their trade or profession that they find it difficult to break the habit. Thus, they can be understood only by

another of their own group. They may say what they mean but to the laymen it does not mean what they think they are saying. What greater service could liberal religion give than to make understandable the significant ideas and conclusions of theology, sociology, philosophy, and other areas of study which describe or affect the lives of men? This would not guarantee agreement but it could provide a basis for the appreciation and respect so essential to the goals of religion.

Jesus, the Radical

HORACE L. BACHELDER

IT WAS a weary world into which Jesus was born. Just how weary he came to realize more and more during the thirty years he spent as a member of an impoverished artisan family. The cloud of Rome's greed hung over the whole earth, obscuring ambition and hope. The East, including Galilee, had for generations been the treasure chest of every Roman adventurer whose fortunes needed recouping. One army after another overran its fertile fields and pillaged its homes, until hope had been blurred out of all life, and

self-respect was dead.

Added to the extortions of the priests in Jerusalem who made more than three and a half million dollars a year from the sale of sacrificial animals alone, there were the insatiable demands of the Herods, the puppet kings. And then, in addition, came the frequent decrees from Caesar that "all the world should be taxed." More money must be forthcoming from the common people to provide the Roman holiday. Degenerate and dissipated Rome was like a great beast, sucking the blood of the whole world;

and from everywhere came the sullen roar of hatred as men saw their slender flocks cut in two, their houses pillaged, their sons carried off as slaves or gladiators, their daughters snatched away to be the playthings of some Roman lord. The world was covered with an everlasting twilight in which men and women moved about wearily, too trod upon to think; too soul-sick to organize opposition. The only recourse was to religion and it was during this time that the belief in heaven, where downtrodden people would have everlasting peace, began developing. And along with this idea of heaven there naturally came the idea of hell. There seemed to be comfort in the notion that heaven's bliss awaited those who lived in a hell on earth while the brutal conquerors and extortioners would be, after life, relegated to their turn in hell. Most of these religions were persecuted by the government and therefore were secret. (The greatest of these and the one which influenced early Christianity the most was Mithraism, whose converts were baptized in the blood of an ox and who then took communion by drinking this blood and eating the raw flesh.) But the leaders of the Jewish religion, which was firmly established and did not need to be secret had

made a bargain with Rome. In return for their assistance in keeping the people from rebelling, and in aiding in the collection of Roman taxes they were to be allowed to continue their life of ease and their extortion from the common people who were considered too ignorant to oppose.

Against all this bitterness of oppression the hot young blood of Jesus rose rebelliously. To him the one sacred and worthwhile thing in the world was personality; every single soul, every man and woman, was a mystical being, wonderfully capable of divine possibilities. That the world should have been handed over to a little group of degenerates who coined men's souls into dollars and ground precious manhood and womanhood into dust and ashes of palaces, and arenas, and temples was to him a sacrilege. All his life he had felt the pinch of poverty. When his father and mother had taken him up to the temple at the age of twelve for confirmation, along with thousands of other Jewish boys, they had been so poor that they had to substitute two pigeons for the usual sacrifice of a young lamb or goat. He had never forgotten that, nor the bitter shame of his parents because of their necessity. His own life, his ministry, could not start until he was thirty, a long

delay in a country where men mature in their teens, because the demands of a family of growing children had kept him at home until they were able to look after themselves. It may be that his surrender of the privilege of marriage was a sacrifice laid upon him by the burdens resulting from his father's death which left him to support the large family of younger brothers and sisters. For there are unmarried men, he said once, who were born incapable of marriage; and there are others who have voluntarily foregone the privileges of marriage for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake. Was he speaking of his own experience? Did there lie back in Nazareth the memory of some defeated romance, crushed to death like too many other joys, by the hand of poverty made ruthless by extortion? We can only conjecture.

His stories of the woman searching feverishly for the lost coin, the shepherd who lost one of his hundred sheep, and many others all point to the struggle for life against poverty. The poor householder who was aroused from his sleep by a guest in the night and who had to beg three loaves of bread from his neighbor was a character easily recognized by his listeners, in whose experience empty cupboards were the rule rather than the exception.

To oppose the status quo, to come out against the ruling classes, to propose reforms in a corrupt system is to be a radical. George Washington, Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson were radicals. The Pilgrim Fathers were radicals. The young man of Galilee was both a political and religious radical. But the Romans had a way of making short work of radicals. When Jesus was a boy a certain Judas, a patriot Galilean, made mad by the tyrannies inflicted on the people, had risen in revolt, and several thousand had followed his leadership. The memory of it must have been with Jesus like a vivid dream and may be the reason he avoided conflict with the Romans and concentrated his attack on the priests and temple authorities. For the Romans had made short work of Judas. Two legions had stamped down upon Galilee and for weeks the sky was made black from the smoke from burning villages; and every crossroad was made horrible with the writhing forms of Judas's followers nailed on crosses in warning to the rest of their kind.

No one needed to tell Jesus the cost of revolt. Yet he who felt he had come to make men conscious of their divinity could not be silent. "Think not," he said to his disciples, "that I come to bring

peace into the world. I am not come to bring peace but a sword." And to those who would follow him he made no attempt to conceal the danger. "If any man would come after me, he must be prepared to take up his cross and follow me." He and his disciples went forth as "sheep among wolves" knowing full well the danger and the inevitable consequences. Yet they went. And the road led to Jerusalem, for the Passover observance. He remembered the city from that time, eighteen years before, when his mother and father had brought him to be confirmed a "son of the law."

The temple area seethed and roared in a scene of strife and confusion. There were cattle dealers, the sellers of birds, and the money changers who exchanged ordinary money for temple money at exorbitant fees. But sadder even than the noise was the indifference with which the pilgrims and other worshippers went about their sacrifices. The temple had always, within their memory, been a marketplace; the priests had always robbed. It did not occur to them that there was anything offensive about the scene this morning but no detail of the shameful sight escaped Jesus. He saw the peasant families bowed in tears because they could not

scrape together enough money to satisfy the greed of the sellers after the priests had rejected the sacrifices they had brought with them as being blemished. He saw the cynical smile of the overseeing priest as he passed the tables, calculating the profits of the day's transactions. Jesus picked up from the floor some pieces of rope and began braiding them together into a whip, silently and thoughtfully. Suddenly, his cheeks red with righteous anger and his eyes aflame, he stepped up to the nearest money changer and threw his table half across the courtyard. Then he strode to the next and overturned it, and the next. A great cheer went up from the crowd as they saw what had happened. By the time he reached the dove sellers and cattle dealers a hundred willing hands assisted in setting the animals and birds loose. They cleared the temple of its dealers and money changers but the priests came running up waving their hands in rage. Looking down at them in calm supremacy of moral courage, the young carpenter replied: "It is written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations.' But you have made it a den of robbers."

That day the whole city rang with his name and crowds of delighted pilgrims followed him

wherever he went. He had a chance to talk to the people about his ideas of a loving Father God in whose sight all were equal. He sowed the seed of democracy which in every age since has proved the most powerful inspirer of self-respect as well as the most active fomentor of revolt. He told them that God had commissioned him to preach to them, that he was God's son, and that all his hearers were God's sons and daughters too. It was radical language and some of his followers expected him to lead a real revolution. He disclaimed all desire to be a king, however, and discouraged talk of an uprising.

Yet he poured out his denunciation on the scribes, the Pharisees, and Herod's puppet government, proclaiming himself a son of Man, not any special man, but just the common, poor, eternally oppressed man. And in behalf of this, his class, he lifted his voice against its oppressors. There came a time in a few days when the people deserted him, impatient because he would not throw his spiritual message to the winds and lead them in arms against their enemies. He continued his radical statements, trying to show the people that outright rebellion was not necessary. But in this, too, he was radical.

In an age when the wages of

protest were death he raised his voice gladly to right the wrongs of men, giving utterance to those great truths which have been the inspiration of every succeeding crusade for the rights of men. If the words of Jesus quoted in the New Testament seem sometimes harsh and jarring, it must be remembered that abuses against which he hurled them were deep-rooted and cruel, and the consciences which he hoped to stir had been a long time dead in indifference. No gentle rebuke could have availed against such intrenched evil.

There is a gulf which separates Jesus the radical reformer from the other reformers of history. These others have protested against economic wrong because it keeps the great mass of men from *having* something that they ought to *have*. Jesus' protest was uttered because men, his brothers, were prevented from *being* something which they ought to *be*—the sons and daughters of their Father God and heirs with him in the kingdom of heaven on earth. The evils against which he protested have not disappeared. There are still rich and poor, oppressors and oppressed, but he put into the hands of the oppressed the weapon with which social righteousness can conquer and, in really democratic countries, has conquered. He

taught them to say, "Thou shalt not do this thing to me, for I, too, am a child of God." His radicalism is like unto that of Patrick Henry who said, "If this be treason, then make the most of it."

Thus Jesus stands as the founder and guiding spirit of all unselfish protest against injustice. But the form of his protest or its language become meaningless unless clothed with the reverence for human souls that prompted it, a reverence great enough to include even the souls of those whose actions he denounced. The protesting, or protestant, spirit which

he fostered may not even seem radical today, at least not radical enough to deserve the death penalty.

His whole teaching may be summed up in the short sentence, "Love the Lord Thy God, and thy neighbor as thyself." This is still the gospel of those who cherish the purest, widest vision of the social future of the world. If his program had only been followed, instead of covered over with the veneer of mysticism and ritual, mankind would today be much closer to his ideal of the kingdom of heaven.

About This Organization Man*

JOHN A. CRANE

THE people and the groups we live among contribute enormously to the creation of the person we are and are becoming. Because we live in society we are able to become a lot of things we could not otherwise be, are able to live a higher and more secure kind of life than we would be able to achieve singly, as isolated individuals.

We recognize this. Not always consciously, to be sure; but somewhere within us we are aware of

our debt. People everywhere are, and have been down through history. So much so indeed that almost all of the peoples of the past have willingly accepted the idea that society is superior to the individual. They have readily fallen into the habit of thinking that the individual exists to serve society, to serve the group from which he derives so much of his being.

Our own country is founded upon the quite revolutionary idea that the reverse of this proposition is true: namely, that society exists for the sole purpose of serving the

*Those of you who have read William H. Whyte's *The Organization Man* will recognize that this article owes a great deal of its substance to the book. Those who have not yet read it, should.

individuals who make it up. We have worked on the assumption here in America that society must contribute to the richness of each man's life, afford each the liberty to be himself, aid him in his pursuit of happiness. We hold these truths to be self-evident. Today, the whole trend of our social thinking is leading us back toward the older notion that the group, the organization, the community is superior to the individual and is of primary importance.

There is a growing feeling among us that when an individual *does* come into conflict with his group, this is owing merely to a misunderstanding on his part, a misconception of his real aims and needs, or to a failure in communication between the parties concerned. If everybody could grasp the whole picture, then there would no longer be any conflict. Only just clear up the misunderstanding, and the recalcitrant individual will serve smoothly like everybody else. It is as simple as that—or so we have come to think.

Our country owes its very existence to a serious conflict between the American colonies and the British society of which it was a part. To put it another way, the American colonies were not adjusted to life in British society, and would not adjust, refused to adjust. Which is really quite a peculiar thing when considered in

the climate of our thinking today, because we have come to think that adjustment is by far and away the grandest of things. Not to be adjusted, not to fit in, to be in conflict with a group—this, we have come to think, is the greatest of evils.

We are each of us individuals, unlike any other in the world; and each of us wants to be an individual. Each wants to be himself. Yet, at the same time, we are all of us members of a variety of groups. We belong to ourselves, but we also belong to others. And we need to belong to others, to groups. We want to. We belong to our families, our companies, our churches, our clubs. We belong to our country, our society.

Each of these groups, by its very nature, asks us to give up a part of our individuality before we can properly belong, be accepted. When we join any of these groups, we must become to some degree, the kind of person it asks us to be. This is the way groups are; and nobody fits into any group exactly. If we are to fit in, to belong, we must change ourselves somewhat, must give up part of ourselves. And even then, the fit is not exact. There is always a little friction between what the group wants, and what any individual within it wants to be or do.

We want to be ourselves, indi-

vidually and uniquely; but we also want to be a part of others—want to belong. The one desire, the one need, must always be an obstacle in the way of full satisfaction of the other. There can never be any neat and permanent resolution of this conflict: we can only strike, again and again, a balancing compromise of some sort.

Our democratic government is one attempt at resolving this conflict in the realm of politics. In a democracy the conflict is resolved by placing the emphasis on the importance of a man's being himself, this at the expense of his being a part of others, of society. Under communism, the conflict is resolved by emphasizing the importance of the group at the expense of the individual.

Working for one of the many large corporations in the United States today is really a grand way to make a living. We have never had it so good. If we should take on a job with one of them, the company will train us thoroughly for the duties we must do; and if, later, we are promoted to higher responsibilities, we may well get additional training. The company will really look after us. It will pay us a liberal salary, and provide us with an expense account that will allow us to travel comfortably on the company's business. It will see that

we are drawn into the friendly social life among the other employees, will go to great lengths to help us to really feel that we "belong" to the company team. The company will give us responsible and demanding work to do in a pleasant atmosphere, will provide office machines and secretaries to lighten the routine details of the work. Should it be necessary for us to move on to a branch office in another city, the company will probably look after the details and the cost of moving. There are a great many concrete rewards to be found in working for a large corporation.

In addition, the company will set up a liberal pension plan to ensure a comfortable life for us when we retire. It will help us to save money by withholding part of our salary, help us to buy stock in the company in the same way. When we are ill, the company will carry us until we are able to return to work.

In short, if we will give of ourselves to the organization, the organization will look after us very well indeed. The company is by no means stupid: it knows that the well-being and loyalty of its managerial men especially is worth paying a high price for. It knows that if it looks after its men, rewards them well, they will give a great deal of themselves in

return — willingly. Why should they not? It is only common sense. You give of yourself freely because you get a lot in return.

Those who thus sensibly surrender themselves to the corporation may be called "organization men."

Now, where exactly do you find these organization men? Well, they work for organizations, of course, and usually very big ones. However, not everybody who works for a big organization is an organization man. For example, a great many clerks and stenographers work for big organizations: *but they only work for them*. The organization man not only works there: *he belongs to the organization* in a very real, almost a spiritual sense: in almost the same way that a monk belongs to his order. He surrenders himself to the discipline and demands of the organization; and the organization, in turn, supplies almost all of his felt needs.

You find these men in commercial corporations, of course, but also in the federal government and in the military services. You find them in churches, too, among the hierarchy; in law firms; on research projects in huge laboratories on campus as well as in industry; in accounting firms; engineering firms; in large management groups everywhere. All these are birds of a feather, whether in

church or science or commerce. All have a great deal in common. They share the problems involved in highly collectivized work. Almost all have some sort of managerial function, working with people rather than things. Most of them will very likely never rise to top management, though the top men will be recruited from among them.

Because they are so numerous and so active, these organization men do much to determine the whole tone of our society: its values, its tastes, its habits, its ideals, its ambitions, its dreams.

Now these are bright young men—intelligent and aware. They can see that they are enmeshed in the immense movements of our social and commercial machinery, can see that they have little chance to exercise their individuality, to be themselves. Yet, they do not feel trapped, or do not mind feeling trapped. They do not seem to mind being submerged in the company's life, because, in their minds, they see the organizations they work for as fundamentally good and humane. They feel that if they give themselves to the organization, they are in good dependable hands, as it were; that the organization will surely look out for them. And it will—quite liberally—so long as they give of themselves freely.

The organization, it is true, *does* ask much in return. The demands it is making on its men are beginning to reach into wider and wider areas of their lives. For example, some few years ago the company began to delve into the deepest levels of its employees' natures with extensive psychological testing programs, and these have become steadily more widespread and more probing. The organization must strive to have the whole man in its field of vision — conscious and unconscious as well—for only so can it begin to predict with some degree of certainty his future usefulness to itself. A man must not hold back any part of himself. He must lay bare his inmost nature for the company to examine and evaluate.

Or again, the organization has recently discovered that the family life of its men may have a far-reaching effect on their usefulness to the company, and so it has begun to take a hand here. The wife is now being drawn into the company's orbit. She, too, must serve the organization by serving her husband well, by not getting in the way of his relationship with the company. Companies are now taking steps to insure this. Plainly, a wife is a big factor in the life of an employee: it is obvious, therefore, that she will play a large part in determining how useful a man will be to his com-

pany.

It is a man's usefulness to the company, to the group that is the primary thing. No sacrifice is too great if this usefulness to the group can be assured. In fact, when you get down to reality, it is not a sacrifice at all, for there is no real conflict between the needs of the group and those of the individual. What is good for the organization is good for the man who belongs there. Or is it?

Now this trend toward groupism, as it has been called, is not confined to large corporations. It represents the direction of social thinking throughout the country. The group is the greatest thing, and adjustment to it the goal. Everywhere—in education, in social life, in business, in religion, in government—the emphasis is on social adjustment as the ultimate aim of every man. The man who does not fit in nicely, the man who prefers to be alone a good deal, the man who does not love the organization dearly—is regarded as somewhat crazy or, at the very least, misguided, certainly not normal, not wholesome.

But let us consider: Is it true that what is good for the company is good for the executive who works there. Yes, this *is true*, for the most part, but there are important exceptions. Seeing these exceptions, and not letting them pass by, distinguishes a genuine

executive from the company man. The man who passively knuckles under to every little whim and quirk of company policy is not the man who does either himself or the company the most good in the long run. An enormous amount of benefit may be derived from the man who courageously chooses to fight the company, fight the entire system, in order to achieve a greater good.

A man must work for the company, to be sure; but *first of all, he works for himself*. He works in order to gain the human and personal satisfactions that work may provide. He works in order that he may fulfill the unique nature with which he has been endowed. The company comes second: a close second, perhaps, but second all the same.

Sometimes the group, the society, the company gains much from the opposition of individuals within it. A great deal of social progress, great advances in humanity, have been derived from those few courageous and prophetic individuals who challenged, even condemned the way of the world, refused outright to submit. They have insisted that the world was wrong and that they were right. The great Hebrew prophets in the Old Testament were such men. Jesus was such a man. So was Socrates. The instigators of the American Revolution were

such men.

These fought society as it was then constituted, fought against enormous opposition, and changed the course of all subsequent history. They fought the world, and the world was obliged, finally, to grant them respect, even grant them gratitude and honor.

The group is grand. Society is salutary. But it is the individual that really matters. Society is only useful so long as it continues to contribute to the development of the individual: even so with a company, even so with a community. When any of these swallow a man, however benevolently, when they smother him even with love—then tyranny begins.

Traditionally, we Americans have had a singular distaste for tyrants. We have long had a great affection for freedom. In the year 1776, Samuel Adams had this to say to those of his fellow Americans who were inclined to be lukewarm about the Revolution:

If ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude [better] than the animating contest of freedom—go from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or arms. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you, and may posterity forget that you were our countrymen.

And indeed, posterity *has* pretty well forgotten them.

Humanism—The Faith That Will Survive*

BRUCE FARNUM

IN THE last few centuries man has made considerable strides in scientific progress. Gone are the days when a three-month cruise around the world would make headlines. In an age filled with the wonders of electronics, world-wide communication, and atomic power, the adage, "reaching for the moon," is no longer a figure of speech but the daily pursuit of many devoted scientists. Yes, thanks to the pioneers of medicine and disease research, we can practically discard the fears of smallpox and scarlet fever epidemics that plagued our ancestors less than one hundred years ago. Taking nature as he found it, man utilized its bountiful resources until automation and expansion forced him to magnify its utility by diverting the course of mighty rivers and constructing immense hydroelectric dams.

Man in his constant quest for progress and survival has been compelled to change his environment. Yet has man's religions changed to meet his twentieth century needs? The fact is that in most

cases religion has not kept pace. On nearly every great world faith time has imposed few changes. Today's views on Heaven, Hell, the soul, and immortality are basically the same as those taught four hundred years ago. Unfortunately Christianity, too, has resisted change. Because of this, orthodox Christianity has been put on the defensive, always eager to condemn and ostracize the few independent thinkers of each generation. Thus, on an unstable glass pedestal, orthodox Christianity will remain until the dawning of an era of unprecedented observation and logic shakes it to the ground and scatters the remnants to oblivion. In my way of thinking, to adhere to the antiquated orthodox traditions of centuries ago is as illogical as to attempt to govern New York City with the laws expounded in the Mayflower Compact.

To many Christian churches, primarily those with unalterable rituals and theologies, this era of logic applied to religion will inevitably bring extinction. But to the few liberal churches, which progressively evolve with time, not striving to make their mem-

*A sermon delivered on Youth Sunday, February 24, 1957, in the First Church, Unitarian, Athol, Massachusetts.

bers conform to the doctrines originated by a primitive and superstitious people eons ago, this will not mean extinction, but the task of leading the movement.

Because our church is not tied to a fixed set of creeds and symbolisms, we shall endure. Is this to say that the ultimate evolution of religion will end in present-day Unitarianism? Definitely not! Only the most liberal form of our faith will survive the test of time and when at last it does emerge supreme, it probably will not be called liberal Unitarianism, but humanism.

In general, humanism may be defined as a faith or philosophy consisting of seven basic ideas. These ideas are not entirely the product of twentieth century humanists, but have slowly evolved during the past twenty-five centuries in which humanists have lived.

The first of these ideas is that of enthusiasm for life. Humanists believe that life should be experienced deeply, lived fully, with sensitive awareness and appreciation of that which is around us. Back through the centuries whenever men have enjoyed keenly the sights and sounds and other sensations of the world about them, and enjoyed these for what they were—not because they stood for something else—they were experi-

encing life humanistically.

The second idea is that nature is worthy of attention and study. Since the day of Aristotle, philosophers and scientists have advocated the uncovering of nature's secrets.

Still another idea is that of confidence in men. For the expression of this idea humanists are deeply indebted to the eighteenth century democrats who had faith in man's ability to control his own destiny. Those were the days of Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson—men who were opposed to any form of government, institution, law, or custom which imposed dogmatic and unnecessary authority on how men shall think and act.

A fourth idea is that of the equality of rights among men, another concept originated by the eighteenth century democrats.

The fifth central idea is that of brotherhood and mutual aid, a theme which is deep-seated in most religions. Whether it be stated in Buddhism as "hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful" or in Judaism as "what is hateful to you do not to your fellow men," the idea is always the same. Humanists feel that if this is the only life we can be sure of, let us make it a worthy one.

Another idea is the acceptance

of the theory of evolution as worked out by nineteenth century anthropologists. The idea that men can turn the process of evolution to their own advantage to further their own highest good and to recreate the world and themselves is at the very center of present-day humanism.

For the last idea, humanists have chosen the basic rule of science, the need for proving theory by experience. No other idea has been of more practical importance to the humanist movement than this one.

Now, let us analyze some questions often directed at humanists. First: "Are humanists agnostics?" Most humanists are agnostics, for they neither affirm nor categorically deny the existence of God. They do not have what James H. Leuba called "a God to whom one may pray in the expectation of receiving an answer." Professor Leuba added, "By 'answer' I mean more than the subjective, psychological effect of prayer." They find no evidence in the universe of any non-human personality which is concerned for the welfare of men. Therefore the question of the existence of a non-human personality is an open one. They feel that where it is perhaps impossible to know, or where we do not know definitely, it is best not to be dogmatic in either direction. They recognize that God is

thought of in a wide variety of ways. The term God is applied by some people to nature, by others to love, by others to goodness in men, and by still others to the grand design—the way things work in the universe. The humanist does not reject impersonal ideas of God but he suggests that there are better ways of expressing these aspects of nature.

Secondly, "What do humanists think about Immortality?" Immortality implies the existence of a soul, a soul which can be separated from the body. Edwin H. Wilson summed up the humanist viewpoint of this subject when he said: "The humanist lives as if this world were all and enough. He is not otherworldly. He holds that the time spent on the contemplation of a possible after-life is time wasted. He fears no hell and seeks no heaven, save that which he and other men create on earth. He willingly accepts the world that exists on this side of the grave as the place for moral struggle and creative living. He seeks the life abundant for his neighbor as for himself. He is content to live one world at a time and let the next life—if such there may be—take care of itself. He need not deny immortality; he is simply not interested. His interests lie elsewhere." Humanists do believe most thoroughly, however, in the kind of immortality which

flows from the effects of actions, effects which often continue long after we have perished.

Often asked of humanists, "Is humanism less complete than other religions?" The answer: No. Although lacking the rigid, fixed scriptures of an alleged revelation, the sources of inspiration written or otherwise, which humanists use, are very wide. This faith draws on all the living poetry and literature that expresses joy and hope. It cultivates the awareness of beauty and the love of man, truth and life. These are dynamic, ever-growing sources of feeling. Infused with these sources of inspiration humanism offers a complete and satisfying philosophy. It not only gives comfort and provides inspiration but it helps individuals to maintain personal well-being and to face and solve the problems of daily living.

Lastly, "Has humanism sacrificed all sense of assurance?" For some people the revealed certainty of the traditional religions has no counterpart in the humanist faith. Others feel differently. If humanists are without a dependable fatherly being who will protect them against nature, they realize that in another sense nature itself is dependable. As men study their environment, it becomes more and more predictable and less and less frightening. As men under-

stand and cooperate with nature they flourish. Humanism is built on the knowledge and method of science so that the humanist does not have to fear for his faith or be forever on the defensive against advancing truth. It gives therefore an assurance and security not available to those whose religion is ever in retreat before the growth of knowledge.

I could not help but find such a faith stimulating. Whereas humanism annoys us by saying that we can look only to ourselves for help, it encourages us by saying that we do not need any other help. Furthermore, it does not insult our intelligence by asking us to accept such obvious fables as Moses crossing the Red Sea and Noah's Ark.

In closing I would like to cite the words of Albert Schweitzer who said:

The world thinks it must raise itself above humanism; that it must look for a more profound spirituality. It has taken a false road. Humanism in all its simplicity is the only genuine spirituality. Only ethics and religion which include in themselves the humanitarian ideal have true value. And humanism is the most precious result of rational meditation upon our existence and that of the world.

The Church and Human Dignity*

V. OGDEN VOGT

RELIGION has now within its grasp an incomparable resource and field of intellectual life and growth. Nothing could be more favorable than the amazing coincidences between the major meanings of modern science, modern philosophy, and the best insights of pure Christianity before it fell into the dualisms of Greek theology. The intellectual life of the church on this new and realistic basis may rise from the dead level of fixed dogmas to the thrilling ventures of new explorations, yet all the while possessed of an assured trust not diminished but more firmly established than ever before. The Spirit of Truth in all its purity and promise may once more become the spirit of the churches.

With equal vigor, the moral life of the normal church may be enlivened to more thoroughgoing influences. The new emphasis of science and philosophy upon the vast web of life that embraces all living creatures becomes a new sanction for the ethics of mutual-ality and respect for life. If it opens also some problems not yet clarified, it adds new vigor to the

Christian doctrine of respect for all human persons. Now that all the world has witnessed the ruthless sacrifices of human lives to the god of the State or the tyrannies of totalitarian rule, the old assertion of the dignity of man is being given new meanings and applications.

The first reassertion may well be the Dignity of Man in His Personal Compassions. It is not only neglect which violates human dignity, sometimes it is patronizing attention. Assistance to the needy may easily be proffered in such a way as to belittle both him who receives and him who gives. It is not respect for persons but contempt of persons to offer merely material stuffs while withholding personal and spiritual association. The old Stoic aloofness is not enough. It was a vertical virtue, too upright to be neglectful, too unbending to show resentment, yet a false dignity of withdrawal into forbearance and isolation. The Christian attitude is the outgoing reach of forgiveness and fellowship. Only such a spirit is fully respectful of persons, and thus an enhancement of human dignity for all concerned.

*Portion of a chapter from *The Primacy of Worship*, by V. Ogden Vogt, soon to be published by the Beacon Press.

It is evident that respect for persons must be manifested not only in personal relations, but in customs and laws as well. The moral concern of the normal church will seek the ways of righteousness for industrial and political life as well as private life. This implies, first of all, the Dignity of Man in His Vocations. The independent farmer, the independent craftsman and storekeeper, these have dignity in their callings. The ancient thirst for independence is in part the thirst for dignity. If it is in some degree a vanity seeking the respect of others, it is more deeply a self-respect imposing self-responsibility. The daily work of every man is so large a portion of his life that it must perforce involve the deepest drives of motive and satisfaction.

Today the world's work cannot be accomplished by independent individual enterprise alone, it requires also the large operations of corporate enterprise. Among the by-products of mass production are the loss of vocational satisfaction and a lessening of individual dignity. Already in many industries various plans of profit sharing tend to overcome these losses. Wherever the real partnership of capital and labor is recognized by some system for shar-

ing profits, human dignity is enhanced.

A restoration of dignity is accomplished also where certain corporations are beginning the experiment of labor representation on boards of directors. Instead of a directorate elected by shareholders only, one or more members are chosen by the entire labor force, wage and salaried.

Another valuable movement of like effect is the annual Vocation Day which some churches have held. A public service in recognition of some one trade or profession and the value of its labors to the community assists its members towards a social point of view about their labor and at the same time upholds their self-respect in the performance of it.

By promotion of these and other movements, the church may foster the view of work for human providence as well as for profit, develop the human values of industry, and assure the dignity of man in his vocations.

At the present time one of our sharpest problems is the Dignity of Man in His Communities. In many towns and cities, there is no total community of human beings. Some are disbarred from a proper share in the privileges and responsibilities which belong by nature to a man. This would not be true had we been less blind

in the recent decades. For so long have we permitted unholy customs of race segregations that we have failed to see that they have become more destructive of the dignity of the perpetrators than of their victims. Certain customs and laws constitute contempt of persons and violate the dignity of human beings. They have at the same time an inescapable reaction. Whoever is contemptuous of another has already lost his own dignity.

Any church may do something towards removing this stain upon American morals. To begin with, it can welcome to its own worship and membership persons of any race or color who may wish to come. Many local parish churches have already done so. In any case, a major ethical project for a normal church must be the assertion of the dignity of man in his communities.

Thrust upon us from many quarters is the need to consider the Dignity of Man in His Diffusions over the habitable globe. In the past this concern was centered in the missionary cause and movement. Lately, it has been the objective of large relief organizations and foreign aids of many kinds on the part of government itself. These all have been highly important manifestations of consideration and respect for mem-

bers of races without distinction all over the earth. None of these is now sufficient for the task involved, though all are in some part still valuable.

Among these efforts, it is the missionary movement which most needs reformation. Its original intentions of respect have all too often turned out to be operations of contempt. On its upper side, it has carried something of the veritable spirit of Christ to many thousands, and extensive educational and humanitarian benefits to many more. On its lower side, it has been blind to the contempt of other peoples and their culture often implied in its method and message. Even today it does not see the range and depth of the aid needed nor its own inadequacy to supply it.

Few can look here and there among various peoples today without a thrill of admiration for their courage in starting upon the path to freedom. Few can look without a touch of dismay in realizing how long that road must be. Freedom is not won just by the riddance of colonialism. Freedom requires many implements by which alone its fair new life may be realized. It requires techniques, technological skills, and machines to provide the basis of physical livelihood. It requires institutions to teach the skills and

manage the machines. It requires laws to regulate the institutions and their productivities. And supporting all, it requires ideas and faiths to compose the laws and sustain them. A free political structure cannot long exist unless upheld by some popular order or harmony of spirit, some prevailing ideology.

In view of the desperate need of statesmen in these new nations for all possible spiritual order and unity among their people, some very searching questions present themselves to the American churches. Have they considered the relations of their foreign missions to the problems of government? Are they aiding the attainment of unity or only introducing new factors of division? If they are bringing a Christianity of quest and faith and venture, they might assist an old religion to new and adequate transformations or they might plant the seeds of some new superceding structure. If they are bringing merely the old unchanging dogmatisms, they are only adding to confusion and rendering all the more difficult the establishment

of free and democratic governments.

Everywhere there is need for constructive ideological formations. At the moment it would seem that the best way to assist the formularies needed abroad is to achieve them more generally at home. If the average American church should long continue in those fixtures of belief which are already a danger to our own political freedom and democratic order, then the less we export our religion the better. If the norm of American religion should become such as I am seeking, however inadequately, to describe, then its structure if not its style would be imitable and helpful abroad as well as at home. It would be a positive furtherance of the dignity of man in all his societies over the earth.

The normal church will find other areas of fruitful moral endeavor under the impulses of the Spirit of Goodness, but it dare not neglect to foster the dignity of man in his personal compassions, in his vocations, in his communities, and in his diffusions over the habitable globe.

Some Future Articles of Interest

Don't Fence Religion In! By Peter H. Samsom
Humanistic Theology By Gardner Williams
The Current Increase of Religion and Bad Conduct... By John Malick

Challenge and Duty

LEO HIRSCH



CIVILIZATION and culture are so burdened with ancient symbols and labels acquired in the past eight thousand years that, if we do not wish them to overwhelm us, we must reëxamine and reappraise them in the light of modern scientific achievements and knowledge.

Contemporary religion, for instance, is based on teachings of bygone eras, teachings often much older than the adherents of modern religion. Then, men understood comparatively little either about themselves or about the universe, so prehistoric and pre-scientific was their thinking. Since the philosophies based on scientific methods and analysis have appeared to render conventional theologies and traditional moral systems empty and sterile, we must provide something in their place. Nor do we mean rival theologies or substitute absolutes in conduct.

Religion should not consist in holding beliefs by "faith" that are denied by rational thought. For example, I do not regard a belief that Jesus was born of a virgin as evidence of a religious turn of mind. Or that he was the only

begotten son of God and therefore divinity incarnate. This holds true with other religious teachers. We do not regard Mohammed as a chosen prophet of God. We do not believe that Moses went up to Mt. Sinai and received a direct message from God. We do not hold that the Pope is in direct communication with God and therefore his words are infallible. The noblest human beings are but facets of the jewel—Humanity. The *whole* beauty and excellence of the jewel does not shine forth from any one of these facets. There is one type of moral excellence in Buddha, still another in Moses, still another in Socrates, still another sublimer than these, and yet *only one* out of many possible ones—in Jesus. The *sum* of moral excellence is not embodied in any one member of human society. It is in the infinite plenitude of spirit that we must look for its manifestation. It is high time that we put away from us this mush of religious sentiment.

Instead of considering religion by way of conventional beliefs, let us employ an unconventional approach. The first rehabilitation

necessary is a revival of faith in man's own potentialities and hopes. This faith must rest on modern scientific method and knowledge. For thousands of years, men have not trusted their own ideals unless these came from a world beyond. But when it is realized that the most generous and flowering of human values came from man himself, and not from heaven, then man begets the confidence in himself to conceive ideals and judge their authority.

What then can we say of man's relation to the universe? Do we know that there is any relation at all, except that man is some curious by-product of it? Perhaps a digression on science and scientific discovery will make our point clear.

To most people, the success that has been achieved by science seems truly remarkable. For instance, the ability of the Newtonian theory of gravitation enables us to predict several years ahead just where and when an eclipse of the sun will occur. Or again, consider Maxwell's theory of light; this theory correctly predicted all the properties of radio long before it was discovered experimentally. Einstein's theory correctly predicted that light, passing near the sun, would be deflected in its path. Through Louis Pasteur and Eli Metchnikoff, we

have become aware of life so minute that it can be seen under powerful electric microscopes. The physicist has revealed the power of the atom and nuclear science. Many examples of a like nature could be given.

Now what is so striking about all these? First, a vast range of physical phenomena was discovered experimentally. Second, it was found that observations could be completely verified and represented by mathematical equations. The harmony and simplicity of scientific law appeals to our reasoning faculties. Physical science comes nearest to that complete system of exact knowledge which all sciences regard as an ideal.

Language is a phenomenally clever medium for expressing the activity, "thinking." Words are labels, symbols that we attach to concepts and ideas. When we speak or write, we show labels corresponding to our "thoughts." Even the meaning that we attach to the word "religion" is open to disagreement simply because it has not had the scrutiny and searching that meanings in science have had. The same may be said of such labels as "God," "faith," "prayer," "material," "spiritual," "blasphemy," etc. There never was undertaken a scientific study and analysis of these different labels and symbols. Thus far, the

work was done by a few, and necessarily limited, but even this limited study resulted in the science of comparative religions. A comparison of religion with religion reduces the claim of each to a monopoly of truth. How nice and simple religion was before

anybody knew anything! The steady growth of information about the real world and man's mind is limiting the free play of speculative imagination. Hence the danger of labels and symbols is idolatry . . . to confuse the symbol with reality.

BOOKMAN'S NOTEBOOK

CHARLES W. PHILLIPS

THE TRANCE OF ACTION

The above theme title is taken from a passage in Wyndham Lewis' *Time and Western Man* (Beacon Paperback, 1957, \$1.95):

"Everything in our life today conspires to thrust most people into prescribed tracks, in what can be called a sort of *trance of action*. Hurrying, without any significant reason, from spot to spot at the maximum speed obtainable, drugged in that mechanical activity, how is the typical individual of this epoch to do some detached thinking for himself?"

We shall come back to Lewis' book presently, but go now to the main book to which we would call your attention, *Posthistoric Man*, by Roderick Seidenberg (Beacon Paperback, 1957, \$1.45). It is without doubt the bleakest and most pessimistic thing on the nature of man and his historic destiny we have ever read. By comparison, Orwell's *1984* is mere melodrama. Ordinarily that should bury it, for a little of Jeremiah is enough, and too much is—too much. This book has,

however, what an English teacher of ours used to hammer upon, "unity, emphasis, and coherence." It is impressive in facts, extraordinarily calm, clear in style and reason, and *such* reasoning! So, better to cuss a little bit about being required to, and start coming to terms with it.

We will take a little more space to set the perspective of the field in which it falls. This column in May-June UNITY emphasized William Whyte's *The Organization Man*. Whyte and David Riesman represent to us a kind of fulcrum on the spate of literature dealing with the individual in the growing collectivism of the times. A somewhat lesser, lighter breed of novels and essays falls off on one side, dealing with gray flannel suits, too much honey, cracks in the picture window, no down payment, etc. This is light literature of protest against what is happening, although there has just appeared Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged*, a king-sized piece of reaction, making a novel out of John T. Flynn, and not signifi-

cant except to show how rattled one can get if he is merely negative. On the other side of Whyte and Riesman, and we might add Fromm's circumspect but real concern, is a little more heavy, sometimes more philosophic, and at least more culturally sweeping perspective. Here we find Krutch, *The Measure of Man*; Frank, *Chart for Rough Water*; Kohler, *Man the Measure*; and moving on up through Toynbee to the theologians. Mumford, Heard, and the two Huxleys should be mentioned too. *Posthistoric Man* lies on this side of the fence, and, to us, is the most important one to come to terms with, philosophically, and religiously.

Putting all of this in a still larger perspective, we feel that the whole of the above points up the main intellectual task of liberalism for the foreseeable future, namely, to conduct an analysis and construction at such a level as we have never yet been challenged to, of theological anthropology, or doctrine of man, in a

secular idiom. Theological anthropology has always been a classical compartment of that discipline. Theology has however been increasingly opaque to Western man for what is now the biggest part of one hundred years. The neo-orthodox revival is an eddy, powerful in its twist but not affecting the main channel. Since man is, and always must be, a primary concern to men, the vacuum had to be filled. Cultural anthropology soon moved from comparative sex-life and gathering artifacts to problems of the "whole" and what the relative dynamisms and constants in human nature were. Almost too ready at hand, however, was "psychology" into which current anthropology is all but dissolved. Sociology stuck more to quantitative measurement in an effort to be scientific, but is now heavily mediating to psychology via "group dynamics" and the significance of symbols conceived purely socially. Secular idiom has taken over completely for practical purposes, and the pretence to an objective yardstick

UNITY

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE
700 OAKWOOD BOULEVARD
CHICAGO 15, ILLINOIS

Please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year, for which

☐ I enclose \$2.00.

☐ Send me bill.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

and method, "Science." Yet what is missing almost as completely to date is the element of "criticism" and the ringing notes of a sense of direction and destiny to overcome the "diffuse anxiety" (Riesman) which is the ubiquitous malaise of our times. So with a secular idiom as the only one available, we still have to add the "theological" dimension (using the word broadly so even humanists can get in the act, as they had better) to a doctrine of man.

Posthistoric Man is a philosophy of history actually, based equally upon the science of nature, and the science of human nature, both of which are connected and unified by finding that they obey together the second law of thermodynamics. The "chaotic mixed-upness" of inorganic nature is replaced in human society by "patterned mixed-upness" but to the same end of an equilibrium of diffused and dissipated energy. Entropy is the to-be-expected result all around. So Whyte and many others see collectivism growing and the individual getting squeezed, and deplore it, but Seidenberg says it is a law of historic and scientific determinism. "... the vast drama of human history [will] eventually find its denouement in the sterile perspectives of a world at least analagous, if not similar to that of the social insects. . . ." Primitive, prehistoric societies operated by instinct and achieved community by "collective organism." During the phase of "history," intelligence rose to combat instinct, in Science has now got over the hump towards eventual dominance, but this will

lead to a "posthistoric" phase of community by "organized collectivism." Freedom, liberty, individualism are illusions of the historic phase "unknown in the remote past and destined to evaporate in the remote future." He does not say how remote. If it were as long as it will take the sun to cool off, we might bury the issue, but one has the feeling he thinks social history is on a speed-up. Seidenberg is a relentless and acute critic of all bulwarks against this fate. Not only does he demolish Toynbee and the salvation of history by transfigured men in a community of saints, he takes intelligence, head over heart, science and the enlightened desires of humanism for the good of all, to the end of demolishing likewise the whole humanistic edifice. We are not "sinners in the hands of an angry God" nor yet "fools in the hands of a relentless universe" but are (or will be) intelligent but insignificant cogs in a meaningless machine. This is not a tongue-in-cheek book and not a stupid one. We have yet to find an answer to it, for no obvious one that will do is lying around.

But Wyndham Lewis in *Time and Western Man* has the old-fashioned tartness we like. This book is chiefly valuable for its prescience (first written in 1927—three years before Ortega's *Revolt of the Masses*) in opposing trends assaulting the individual, for some good literary criticism in the first half, and for some sharp criticism of "organismic" philosophies. His targets are Bergson, James, Spengler, and Whitehead.

Be well advised that this is a savage attack and not altogether fair to the full intent of the men involved. Still it is a legitimate attack on interpretations which may be made, and sometimes are, of the philosophy of organism. Having seen what the twelve did to Jesus, and Kilpatrick did to Dewey, one has to give a sharp second look at disciples. Our Whiteheadians might well look at this, both those for whom Whitehead is the anchor of their theism of a naturalistic variety, and those for whom he just anchors naturalism. Also, without demeaning Science, Lewis makes a plea for the independent integrity of Art.

We would make one more brief mention: Karl Polanyi's *The Great Transformation* (Beacon Paperback, \$1.45). This is a study of the political and economic origins of our times, a fresh attack on classical economic interpretations and the market economy, which finds that the first and last word in determining events is "society" (the blasted collective again). A brave last chapter on "Freedom in a Complex Society" holds that we can plan to be free but it is awfully flat to us when it turns out that the new freedom is literally "resignation."

So, if we are not sure yet of the weapons by which to assault this, we will take a text for our operation in this "trance of action" from William James, after he escaped from a few days in the idyllic society of Chautauqua: "Oh for an Armenian massacre!"

BOOKS IN BRIEF

They will have to be brief this time. November 4 is the scheduled publishing date for A. Powell Davies' last book, *Paul, The First Christian*. Farrar, Strauss and Rinehart is doing it—only a hardback listed.

We call your attention to the Anvil series of paperbacks, published by Van Nostrand. A departure in many of their titles to this end: taking a subject like *Conservatism*, e.g., by Peter Viereck, it will have an essay on the subject by the author, and then a generous collection of the pertinent sections of major conservative documents in the modern period. Some other titles are exclusively collections of primary sources: *Fifty Major Documents of the 19th Century*, and *Fifty Major Documents of the Twentieth Century*. What we have looked over in this series is pretty well done, and we like very much the idea of the primary sources being brought to light on the subject at hand, when you want them. The uniform pricing on them is \$1.25.

Gateway Editions is the paperback trade name of Henry Regnery and Company. Here, at various pricings from \$.65 to \$1.25, you can stock your library with most of the philosophic classics quite cheaply and give them a look once in a while. Something handy on Thomas Aquinas is hard to come by, but they have his *Treatise on Law; On Truth and Falsity; and On Human Knowledge* for \$.95.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

ELLSWORTH M. SMITH, *Executive Secretary*

Unitarians Together

The priceless ingredient of the Unitarian religion is its freedom. It is free from authority and free from Authorities. This is more important than we usually realize, for religion, as the value-making function of human life, must, especially in these days, be able to expand and redirect its search to meet the implications of daily discovery. A closed-system religion cannot do this. Unitarianism is almost alone a free religion in this sense.

The important thing that Arius did in 325 A.D. was not to disbelieve that Jesus was God but to insist on his right to believe and express his disbelief. He asserted freedom. We are free only when we act free.

The important thing for Unitarians today is to exercise their freedom to the full in fellowship with each other. It is also important to gain the advantage of using the scientific method. We should make a careful appraisal of all the elements of our experience and all possible knowledge of humanity, our world and our universe, and build our elements of personal faith on a very healthy respect for facts. This method is useful to religion in the highest degree. It offers the greatest possibility for human gain. It is experimental. It is speculative only in close relevance to the

available facts. Such a faith is built upon action and the evaluation of experience. Its hopes and affections are never strangers to objective reality. It is superlatively vigorous. It flows. It is self-correcting and self-cleansing. It is possible only in a religion that is free.

As a preacher I would like to describe the invitation to religious adventure that the use of scientific method offers us. As a moralist I would like to point out how indispensable these procedures of freedom are in solving the problems of our world. As an administrative person, however, I will consider the practical aspects of our common enterprise in this framework.

Unitarianism in America is growing at an amazing rate. We have come from an ebb of 47,000 in 1936 to over 100,000 today. We have grown 25 per cent in the last three years. There are twice as many Unitarian societies in the Western Conference today as there were ten years ago. There are probably nearer four times as many societies along the Pacific Coast as there were ten years ago. We have over 200 fellowships today; we expect to have 700 ten years from now.

We have had periods of rapid growth before. Let us fix it firmly in our minds that those periods in the past yielded to long decades

of slow decline because we never got close enough together to compact our growth into a vigorous organization or movement. We did not bother to use objective methods to consolidate our gains. We were stand-offish to the point of self-destruction. We used our freedom for self-satisfaction instead of to expand our fellowship and extend our challenge.

I would point out to you that the freedom we share gives us all the opportunity in the world to be ourselves, individually, unhampered by responsible relations with fellow-Unitarians. But this ego-centered use of freedom is a childish delight. Again, to feel that organization and common effort compromise individual freedom is an either/or trap that doesn't bear logical examination. Our freedom gives us the priceless opportunity to explore, to experiment with and to develop a fellowship of such acceptive, non-judgmental, and supportive nature as would be the perfect answer to the needs of moral man in an immoral society. We need such a fellowship for the health of our souls; society needs it for its survival.

For these reasons I believe we should accept every opportunity to support and enjoy our free religious fellowship with our best effort, our wisest judgment, and our most vigorous sense of adventure. We should give it sufficient funds to "grow its length out."

In many areas of our common enterprise we try to operate with too little organization and too little working together. If we dismiss this observation with annoy-

ance or unconcern we shall almost certainly see, within a few years, our present bright and wonderful growth yield again to slow decline.

In your own religious life, explore, act, evaluate, and grow. In our common life let us use good methods and good organization as frankly and confidently as we do in our other enterprises. Nothing is so vivid as the fact of solid achievement. If freedom is good, let us extend it. If talking sense in religion is useful, then let us talk sense with more people. The greatest joy in our free religious fellowship is in savoring the good things that people do and that happen to people in our midst. Let us be Unitarians together. Do not even try to be a Unitarian by yourself!

Conference News

The Western Conference Plan to develop advanced services and programming to cost \$25,000 has been endorsed by the Board of Directors of the United Unitarian Appeal and becomes part of the U U A—Western Conference Plan for 1957-58. At the meeting of the U U A Board in Atlantic City we were given the "Go" sign to combine our additional \$25,000 with the U U A's \$85,000 and to seek a total of \$110,000 from Western Conference churches and fellowships for total denominational support this year. This is nearly double the \$56,000 that was contributed last year. By special vote, the Western Conference is to begin receiving additional funds when we have contributed \$70,000 to the U U A, and the amount will reach the desired \$25,000

when and if we reach our goal of \$110,000. The Plan recommends that churches and fellowships vote corporate commitments of the amount they will send to the U U A for this combined program; that they then incorporate the amount in future budgets and pay at monthly or quarterly intervals. Reports are already in of churches that have voted to accept the procedures of this Plan and of churches that have notably increased or doubled their commitment. It is urged that each church and fellowship, as it sees fit, use the informational services of the Area Conference U U A Chairman at a time when this Plan is to be discussed and voted on by the Board or Congregation of the local group. Travel expenses for the Area U U A chairmen are provided by the campaign budget.

The Western Conference brochure describing this Plan is still in process, but should be mailed to all churches and fellowships in quantity within a month. Also upcoming is the first issue of the Western Conference *Newsletter*.

The following Conference Committees will be meeting in the near future: Committee of L R Y'ers to plan the 1958 L R Y camp conference (there may be two, east and west); Conference Committee on Fellowships, and Program-Planning Committee.

A meeting is projected in Denver, December 14 and 15, to plan our first Rocky Mountain Summer Assembly, to be held next August in Estes Park.

The Unitarian Church in Urbana, Illinois, and the Universalist Church in Champaign have become the merged Universalist-

Unitarian Church of Champaign-Urbana. The former Universalist church is to be the "church" and the Unitarian Church the Student Chapel. Reverend Arnold Westwood and Reverend Earle McKinney are the ministers of the merged parish, and Richard Kelaway is the Director of the student program.

The Channing-Murray Foundation at Madison, Wisconsin, has been assured of a grant from the Alliance Jubilee Fund to help step up its program (centering in a building on campus) by employing a full-time Director. Churches in the North Central Area Conference have indicated their willingness to contribute to this advanced program.

The Unitarian Fellowship in East Lansing and the Universalist Church in Lansing, Michigan, have combined as the Universalist-Unitarian Church of Greater Lansing, with the Reverend Gerald Wyman as minister.

The Federated Church of Flint (Congregational-Unitarian) has become the Flint Unitarian Church.

The following ministers are being installed: Rev. Karel Botermans, minister of the Flint, Michigan, Unitarian Church; Rev. Thomas Smith, minister of the Unitarian Churches of Duluth and Virginia, Minnesota; and Reverend Robert O'Brien of First Unitarian Church of Cincinnati.

Four Meadville Theological School students are giving occasional service at fellowships in the Chicago Area: Harold Patterson at Dixon, Illinois; William Jacobson at Decatur, Illinois; James Curtis at Janesville, Wisconsin;